

**COMMISSION CONFERENCE****March 18, 2003**

<u>Agenda Item</u>		<u>Page</u>
I-A	City of Fort Lauderdale's New URL and Website Design	1
I-B	Downtown Regional Activity Center (RAC) Dwelling Units	2
I-C	Proposed New River Master Build-Out Plan for Day Dockage	10
I-D	Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) - Proposed Improvements to U.S. 1 (Federal Highway) from Commercial Boulevard to McNab Road (C-14 Canal)	12
I-E	School Board of Broward County Facility Study Update	14
I-F	Single Entrance Fee for Parking for Special Events	17
II-A	Accelerated Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Quarterly Report for the First Quarter of 2003	18
III-B	Advisory Board Appointments	18
	1. Budget Advisory Board	(Deferred)
	2. Code Enforcement Board	18
	3. Community Appearance Board	(Deferred)
	4. Economic Development Board	(Deferred)
	5. Education Advisory Board	19
	6. Unsafe Structures and Housing Appeals Board	(Deferred)
IV	City Commission Reports:	19
	1. FDOT Projects	19
	2. Fire Safety Issues for Condominiums	19
	3. River Oaks Property Acquisition	19
	4. FPL - Colee Hammock and Victoria Park	20
	5. MPO Appointments	20
	6. Flea Market at Gay and Lesbian Community Center (GLCC)	20
	7. Police Department	20
	8. Elections	21
	9. Orientation for New City Commission	21
	10. Theater Evacuation	21
	11. Crossing Guards/Rock Island Elementary	21
	12. Convenience store at NW 24 <sup>th</sup> Avenue and 19 <sup>th</sup> Street	21
	13. Traffic Light at Bayview Drive and Commercial Boulevard	22
	14. 62 <sup>nd</sup> Street - Speeding from US 1 to Dixie Highway	22
	15. Mayor of Miami Beach/Bill Regarding Property Rights	22
V	City Manager Reports	22
	1. City Commission Workshop	22
	2. Artist Marcell/Donation of Firefighter Sculpture	22
	3. Support for the Armed Forces	22

Present: Mayor Naugle  
Commissioners Hutchinson, Teel, Moore, and Trantalis  
Also Present: City Manager  
City Attorney  
City Clerk  
Sergeant Wheeler

**I-A – City of Fort Lauderdale’s New URL and Website Design**

The City Manager welcomed the two new Commissioners. He explained that he wanted to disclose officially for the first time the City’s new website. He stated they had been placing a lot of emphasis on improving their communications beyond the printed word, and how the City was looking in Cyberspace. He proceeded to introduce Leslie Backus, Director of Communications.

Leslie Backus thanked everyone for the opportunity to demonstrate the City’s new redesigned and updated website. She stated they had been on line since 1995, when, at the Mayor’s request, they had put out one of the first municipal websites in the State. She explained that since that time the site had grown and included over 2,000 pages of information, including City programs and services such as the live broadcasts of Commission meetings. She stated that in the past the site had lacked consistency. She explained that about one year ago Mark Dennin had been hired as the City’s webmaster and one of his first tasks was to completely redo the site. She stated that they were going to show the new website to the Commission, including some new features which had been added as early as this morning.

Mark Dennin, Webmaster, stated that they had launched the new design on March 1, 2003, with a new address for the City which was [www.fortlauderdale.gov](http://www.fortlauderdale.gov) and he felt it reflected what the City did and stated that they were happy to have such an address. He commented that e-mail addresses at this time for employees would remain the same, and no change would be implemented for at least 2-3 months.

Mr. Dennin stated that in developing the new design the main things he wanted to focus on were improved useability, improved functionality, and consistency of design. He explained that the basic design stayed the same, but the elements had changed. He proceeded to show the main home page and explained they were attempting to organize information into various areas. He stated they wanted to provide multiple ways for people to find information, and one of the things they did was create four major divisions of information. Those divisions were: City Hall, Business, Community and Leisure. He stated they were broad areas with a lot of flexibility and within those areas one could locate various departments.

Mr. Dennin stated there were some new features on the main site which did not exist previously, and those were a site search, “I want to” index, alphabetical index of departments, “This Week”, Festival and Events, Downtown Live, and “What’s New.” He explained at the top of the page was something called “bread crumbs” which left a trail as to where one had been and could be used to navigate to various areas.

Mr. Dennin explained that now parking tickets could be paid on line. Other features for the future which were under consideration were on-line registration for classes and job applications. He stated that another new application he was presently working on was “On-line Calendar of Events.”

Commissioner Moore asked if Community Development was listed. He was informed that was an area which was presently under development. Commissioner Moore asked if under Community Development the particular grants and rehabilitation programs would be listed, along with an application process to be used. Mr. Dennin stated it was not there at this time. Ms. Backus remarked they were developing such information for this department, and if the application could be accommodated on a standard textile form then it could be put on the website.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that under Economic Development it talked about the proposed "New World Aquarium," and that was not a project being considered at this time.

The Commissioners all remarked that the new website looked great. Mr. Dennin further stated that this had been presented to the different departments for their review and he was waiting upon feedback so that all information could be updated.

The City Manager stated that excitement had been generated when this new website had been shown, but there were still a number of items which needed updating, and requested everyone to be patient.

Mayor Naugle asked how many hits the City was getting as of this time. Mr. Dennin remarked that it averaged to about 1,000 searches per week for information, and in terms of hits they were getting about 50,000 per week. Mayor Naugle asked if "Employment" was still the number one source for information. Mr. Dennin confirmed and reiterated that "Employment" was No. 1, "Jobs" was No. 2, and then it went down from there. He stated this type of information was useful in letting them know what the public wanted. Mayor Naugle asked if the link was still available to the code. Mr. Dennin confirmed.

Commissioner Teel stated that there had been difficulty accessing the video through AOL and asked if that was going to be corrected. Mr. Dennin replied that if the problem existed before the revamping of the website, then it probably still existed. He explained that the video used a normal windows media player file, but he stated he would look into the AOL problem.

Mayor Naugle congratulated them on such a good job.

Mr. Dennin reiterated that this was not the end of a process, but was just the beginning.

**Action:** As Discussed.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 1:57 p.m. and returned at 1:58 p.m.

### **I-B – Downtown Regional Activity Center (RAC) Dwelling Units**

The City Manager stated that he hoped everyone had received the Addendum he had issued at the request of the Mayor which was information that had summarized unit counts.

Cecelia Hollar, Director of Construction Services, stated that she wanted to give a brief overview of the reason why staff had presented this item. She stated that Bruce Chatterton, Planning and Zoning Services Manager, would supply more detail on the specifics of the agenda memo.

Ms. Hollar stated they were looking for direction from the Commission on three areas in respect to the downtown Regional Activity Center. She stated that the first thing was how and where units that would become available from the County would be allocated. She stated the second item was under what criteria and process would the allocation of the units occur. The third was whether the units should be released immediately or suspended until such time new Code regulations were developed.

Ms. Hollar stated they were not adopting any new criteria or processes, but just wanted to supply the Commission with some information. She further stated that the workshop held with the previous Commission in October helped them to formulate some ideas and concepts. She then proceeded to introduce Bruce Chatterton who would walk through some of the elements and supply some background information as to the location of the RAC and its units for the new Commissioners. She added that these would not be new units, but were purely a transfer of units from other areas of the City.

Bruce Chatterton, Planning and Zoning Services Manager, proceeded to show the location of the downtown RAC on the map. He explained that it was a distinct and separate regulatory area from the

northwest and south RAC. He stated there was also an RAC for the Central Beach area. He stated that the purpose of the downtown RAC was to allow redevelopment and encourage residential uses. He further stated that if one looked at the Comprehensive Plan and what it summarized as the purpose of the RAC, it was to facilitate mixed-use development, encourage mass transit thereby reducing the need for auto use, provide incentives for quality development, and give definition to the urban form of the downtown.

Mr. Chatterton further explained there were no specified limits on the amount of non-residential development in the RAC, but clearly there were limits on the amount of residential. He stated that currently 5,100 units were allocated to the RAC by the City's Comprehensive Plan and the County's Land Use Plan. He stated that only 4 units were left which had not been allocated to a particular development.

Mr. Chatterton stated that in July, 2002, the Commission had adopted a plan amendment to provide for 2,906 units. He explained this was not an increase in density for the City and did not involve increasing the density of the County's plan. He stated that the units were being transferred from adjoining built-out neighborhoods under the County's flex process which was also part of the City's land use plan. Overall, impacts would not increase as a result of this, nor would overall density.

Mr. Chatterton further explained that the plan amendment was born from an action plan which had been developed by representatives of both the City and the County. He stated this was not intended to be a long-term solution, but a stop gap measure permitting some downtown development to occur in the right circumstances. He stated that the participants of the action plan also called for a downtown master plan to be developed to address the long-term implications. He stated that the plan amendment called for 2,197 units to be allocated in the area north of Broward Boulevard, and 763 south of Broward. He stated further that the final step in the approval of the units was the recertification by the Broward County Planning Council at the end of April.

Mr. Chatterton pointed out that the original 5,100 units were available on a first-come/ first-serve basis. In the past the Commission had expressed the desire that the additional units not be on a first-come/first-serve basis, but that criteria be developed to allow the units to go to the best project. He stated that since August, 2002, they had been working on the Downtown Master Plan which was headed by Ken Greenberg and his consulting team. He remarked that project was scheduled to be completed by the end of July, 2003 and had been completely funded. He explained there had been some delay in the schedule due to the need to coordinate the efforts of the Subarea Mobility Study and to make sure the consulting team had full discussions with the stakeholders in the community. He explained that the Phase I report of the Greenberg team was on the website under "What's New." Mr. Chatterton also added that a community meeting regarding this master plan was scheduled for April 10, 2003, at 6:30 at the Performing Arts Center.

Mr. Chatterton reiterated that their purpose at today's meeting was to initiate the discussions regarding the criteria and process for allocating the units. He stated that draft criteria had been submitted in the Commission's back-up material and had been derived from the draft planning principles arrived at by the Greenberg team, and they also reflected the principles of smart growth, and some of the ideas articulated by members of the Commission. He explained that the criteria had to do with a number of things which were important to everyone such as: Promoting work force housing, reinforcing neighborhood identity, allowing for the right transition between buildings, promoting the right type of mixed-use development, improving pedestrian orientation and connections, enhancing the street system, promoting transit ridership, and preserving and enhancing on-street parking. He stated that the Greenberg team felt it was important to "green" the downtown and projects could help to bring in canopy, pocket parks, and greenways.

Mr. Chatterton further stated that the Greenberg team had also floated the idea of a Design Center to review projects against the criteria which were being used in many cities throughout the country. He

explained that members of those centers often included development professionals, landscape architects, urban designers, and transportation engineers, and the cities tended to use these centers as clearing houses for public information. He stated that a typical Design Center would be on the ground floor within the area of concern at the time. Displays of current projects would be available to the public and possibly set times would be arranged where a particular project could be viewed and discussed. He reiterated that the idea behind a Design Center, if done properly, was that it could provide for open discussion between the community and the development community. He also added that a design competition could be held whereby they would open the availability of the units for a set period of time such as 180 days in which the projects could be reviewed by the Design Center against the criteria. At the same time, City staff would review the projects for compliance with the ULDR. He explained that the Design Center would provide the results of their review to the Commission for their final decision.

Mr. Chatterton remarked that there were some other issues in which they wanted direction from the Commission. He stated that a good portion north of Broward Boulevard was within the limits of the CRA, and it had been suggested that a set number of units should be distributed exclusively to the CRA. He stated the question was should the CRA be subject to the same criteria or should they be available to the CRA on a first-come/first-serve basis as an incentive for redevelopment. He believed the CRA staff was developing a legal basis for justifying exclusive distribution of the units for the CRA.

Mr. Chatterton stated that the Commission had also discussed previously that of the 763 units which were south of Broward Boulevard, that the bulk or all of them should go south of the River, and if that was the Commission's direction, then they would need to explore legal and planning justifications as well.

Mr. Chatterton reiterated that today they were asking for the Commission's approval to develop these ideas as a beginning. He explained further that the Design Center was just one idea and one way of doing things. They believed it had merit or they would not be suggesting it to the Commission. He also stated that idea needed to be presented to the Urban Design Core Steering Committee for the Downtown Master Plan. He stated that they wanted to develop these ideas in concert with the completion of the Downtown Master Plan process, and that perhaps zoning in progress could also be enacted to suspend allocation of the units. The units could then be allocated through the Design Center process or some other means after the completion of the Downtown Master Plan.

Ms. Hollar stated that if the units were recertified by the Planning Council and they became available without suspension of the units, they would fall under today's regulations which made them available on a first-come/first-serve basis.

Commissioner Moore stated that Mr. Chatterton constantly spoke of the Downtown Master Plan and its importance, but he asked how many units did Mr. Chatterton think would be proposed for the downtown area. Mr. Chatterton stated that the Downtown Master Plan would be looking at the overall densities and intensities. He stated that he had not yet heard any specific figures, but they did know that a well done downtown master plan could be the basis for future requests in solving a long-term problem of availability.

Alan Hooper, member of the DDA and Developer in the CRA, stated that to put this off for a period of time in order to wait for a master plan to be considered would slow down the development in the CRA. He felt the CRA at this point in time had a momentum going and if one took 2,000 units and spread it over 135 acres, one would be talking about 15 units per acre, and it would take about 2 years to develop a site from acquisition through to development. He stated that TIF was dependent on the product to come on line in order to generate taxes so they could be reinvested throughout the entire CRA. He felt the "train had left the station," and to put it off too long and not allocate the units would stop the train.

Commissioner Moore clarified that the master plan ran to the railroad tracks. Mr. Hooper replied that it went to the tracks to Searstown. Mr. Chatterton confirmed. Mr. Chatterton replied that the northwest CRA on the other side of the Flagler right-of-way had its own inventory of units and units were available in that area.

Commissioner Moore asked how many units were available in that area.

Kim Jackson, Director of the CRA, stated she believed they were upwards of 7,000 to 8,000 units.

Stan Brown, Chairman of NWPFH Redevelopment Advisory Board, stated that they needed to be sure that there was perspective in how the CRA had developed over the last 5-6 years. He explained that projects in the CRA went through an extensive process of negotiation of design criteria. He stated that there was a process in place, and the second part of that process was that the Commission reviewed the projects. He further stated that they had hoped for some sort of special consideration within the CRA assuming they met the design criteria and requirements.

Courtney Crush, attorney, stated that in considering how to create pools of units there were some properties in the City which had recent plat note amendments on them for a specific number of residential units. She stated further that she would like for the Commission to consider in allocating the units that they might be vesting rights associated with the properties and going into a process that might be based purely on design and excluding geographic areas, which was something they did not want to see happen. She stated that they wanted to pursue this discussion with staff and the City Attorney. She added that she was representing Summit Properties, and some other property owners who were not yet in the site plan approval process at this time who were Cabi Developers and Las Olas Riverhouse.

Mayor Naugle stated that remarks had been made that if the units were not allocated there could be a moratorium, and he proceeded to ask if there was a dilapidated building in need of redevelopment, could someone demolish it and build something in its place without using the units.

Ms. Hollar stated that whatever was on the site at this time was what they were vested for, and they could redevelop, and there would be no moratorium. She stated that there would be no restrictions on how you could redevelop and the buildings would not have to look the same.

Mayor Naugle clarified that the flex units were to add density or apply residential to a commercially zoned area. Ms. Hollar agreed and stated that it was to encourage more of a mixed-use development. She further stated that since land values were so high in the downtown, it was the density yield that they needed in order to be able to make the new product work. Mayor Naugle clarified that the western part of the CRA had units. Ms. Hollar explained that the northwest area was a different RAC which encompasses the CRA which has a significantly larger number of units available.

Mayor Naugle stated that if the artificial units were created to increase the density and if one couldn't build there, then possibly the developers would construct in those areas where the units were available instead of building to the east. Ms. Hollar stated that this matter had been discussed at the workshop in October and if the units were suspended at this time, then possibly redevelopment could move west.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the ones on the south fell into the non-conforming situation. Ms. Hollar stated that was a different RAC which also was on the agenda for April, and she stated that was to rectify the situation of what was there today. She explained if one had existing residential, one could demolish it and rebuild what was there previously.

Mayor Naugle stated that he felt it would be smart to put the additional units on hold and steer some development to the northwest, and have some breathing room from the building that was presently going on in the downtown. He felt it would give them time to get a mechanism in place to allocate the units. He asked if they could recover their costs.

The City Attorney stated that he was inclined to say they could look into the matter. He stated further that they would have to go back and look at the application fees, the fees for review of development permits, allocate the true costs to the fee, and then change the fee.

Moore stated that he liked the concept that there were 8,000 or more units in the northwest quadrant, but also what was lacking in that area was a master plan. He felt if there were going to be development opportunities, he believed that the housing market, costs and availability of units needed to be done so as not to be detrimental to the community. He felt there had to be a plan and focus such as what was being designed with the CRA, and the community as they began coming up with a concept as to how the developments would work. One the key things they had always said was that when the CRA boundaries were determined, it was due to the fact there was a feeling that because of land assemblies which had taken place from Andrews Avenue to Federal Highway, there had been an interest for the development to take place. The increment could then be used to deal with subsidies which would allow affordable units to be built in the northwest quadrant.

Commissioner Moore stated that he did not want, nor did the residents, a developmental process that would exclude them from being the actual owners of the units being developed. He stated that development in this City because of the SUN Fund, employment, educational structure, and the good job done with the social network of the Performing Arts, could occur at market rates which would price out individuals he represented. He reiterated that he wanted affordable housing in the northwest and he felt the RAC should be shifted to the north side of Sistrunk Boulevard between 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Federal Highway to Sunrise Boulevard. He also felt it could be directed to the northwest quadrant where the railroad track was, but he only wanted to stress that if there was to be a plan that there was a need for two. He felt the viability of the redevelopment proposed for the northwest, due to the availability of the units, needed a master plan.

Commissioner Moore remarked that he felt the increment was of vast importance and if the opportunity for development was eliminated and it was tabled for about two years, it could slow down the entire redevelopment of the CRA. He felt they needed to keep in mind why certain things happened the way they did.

Mr. Brown stated that 60% of the land in the Flagler area was vacant and did not have units even if they were to do a replacement. He stated that the CRA Board had a policy statement that discussed the type of development being done in that area, and that statement included bonding. He suggested that this needed to be revisited within the CRA Board, and if there was a need for design criteria they could have that within 30-60 days and developed in a way that would be consistent with what had already been done.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that this was an opportunity for everyone to take a breath as it related to downtown development. She stated that she was concerned when the 5,100 people showed up because no one knew what would happen. She stated that one of her concerns dealt with the \$45 Million being spent in the CRA area, and she felt that the brakes should possibly be put on as it related to the availability of the units. She asked if the City was in the driver's seat in regard to the flex units.

Ms. Hollar stated that they were waiting on the County, and if they did not recertify the plan, then all this discussion would be moot. She stated that they wanted direction from the Commission before that happened because if in April they approved them, an application could be received the next day. She did not want it to become a "free for all." She further stated that she felt as if they were in a "Catch-22" as it related to the units. She felt if they did not look for some criteria and the County was in the driver's seat and the units were allocated, they would be back to a first-come/first-serve basis.

Mayor Naugle stated that he felt if the City asked them to hold off that they would honor the request, and if they did not then other plans would have to be made.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated she was concerned with the CRA area and the money allocated last year. She stated that projects were still coming out of the ground in downtown which had been approved a while back, and now there were no units left. She reiterated that it was an opportunity to "take a breath" and see what was going to happen in the downtown area.

Commissioner Teel stated that it was clear to her that the brakes should not be put on, but they needed to be careful so it would not be a "free for all" as it had been in the past. She stated that she hoped there could be a way of encouraging development for the northwest and it could be an interim step. She stated that she was concerned that the master plan would take too long. She felt it ended up being a balancing act, but she felt a breather was necessary.

Commissioner Trantalis stated there were competing interests. There was investor interest and he felt they should not put the brakes on that, but at the same time they did not want it to run rampant because there was a lot of master planning to do and traffic issues to deal with before more units could be built. He felt if the County was about to release more units, then this should be anticipated and the City should agree to move forward and allow design criteria to be established. He stated that he had a problem with trying to socially engineer where housing should take place, and all they could do was try to encourage developers to move into an area, but the bottom line was that the market would determine where people would purchase homes.

Commissioner Trantalis felt the issue was whether to move forward and allow the design criteria to be established in anticipation of the County releasing the units for the City. He stated that if that was the sole issue, it would make sense to move forward in that regard because they would not be committing themselves to nothing but the planning and design process.

Mayor Naugle stated that since the Greenberg study was to be done in July and nothing was presently in place to recover costs, and the costs to be expended for the criteria and their administration, possibly the County could defer the decision on the units until November. Therefore, when the units became available they would not only have the criteria in place, but also the possibility of recovering some of the costs.

Commissioner Hutchinson clarified that everyone was assuming that the criteria would run in conjunction with the master plan. Mr. Chatterton confirmed.

Ms. Hollar stated that the City could request that the units be deferred until November.

Commissioner Moore asked what would make it a "free for all." He stated if the units were allocated by the County and a design criteria was put into place stating how they were to be allocated, then it would not be a "free for all." He agreed it should not be that way, and he felt that the CRA could meet and then come to the Commission and make some recommendations. He felt this would be the most logical way to address the matter.

Commissioner Moore stated that the next possibility would be to have a developer build on both sides of the tracks. He felt they did not have to delay things until November. He stated that what everyone wanted to see was well-planned development that was addressing the issues which were of concern. He did not feel anyone was saying no to development.

Ms. Jackson remarked that the CRA Advisory Board was scheduled to meet March 26, 2003 and they came before the Commission on April 8, 2003.

Ms. Hollar clarified that if the City wanted to ask the County to defer action until November, then there would be no units to distribute, but if we allowed them to continue on April 24, 2003, and there was no guarantee the units would be given the recertification, then the units would be added to the Comprehensive Plan but would still not be allocated.

The City Attorney stated that there was a lawsuit pending which had been filed within the last week for Declaratory Judgment for allocation of units which the City did not have yet. He further stated that a down side to withdrawing the City's application for recertification and getting the units into the City's "basket" for distribution was that the County was not presently happy with how municipalities had been handling redevelopment, and were looking for ways to get into the redevelopment business. He



suggested that the City get the units before the County decided to control redevelopment because they might not be available later on.

Commissioner Moore asked what would be the problem if they got the allocation and it took a couple months to come up with the criteria.

The City Attorney stated that the third recommendation was the application for zoning in progress which would mean that as long as the City was considering an ordinance to set the criteria, they would not be allocating any of the units.

Commissioner Moore stated he felt that was a course to consider. He further stated that he was concerned about a developer coming in stating they would build so many units, but then nothing would come out of the ground and time kept getting extended. He asked how many of those types of units were out there. Mayor Naugle remarked that he thought there was only one project and that an extension had been granted by the CRA Director instead of the Commission. He believed there was a system whereby the Director could extend time and bypass the Commission. Commissioner Moore replied that he did not want to get into the politics and only wanted to know the exact number.

Mayor Naugle asked how many phantom units were out there. Ms. Hollar replied that they could calculate that, but stated that two things could happen. She stated that if the site plan expired under the original 5,100 units, the units would go back to the original pool and would still be available on the first-come/first-serve basis. She explained that they were not proposing changes to that.

Mr. Chatterton stated that currently they had approved two projects but they were not under construction. One project had 348 units and the other had 372 units. Ms. Hollar commented that any of those were potentially subject to expiration.

The City Attorney stated that what they were attempting to do was to address the new units coming on line now, and not revamp the whole process.

Mayor Naugle remarked that he felt November would provide some breathing room.

Commissioner Moore remarked that he preferred to go forward with the proposal that the City get the allocation, and then state that they would be dealing with the criteria for that allocation.

Commissioner Teel asked if it was realistic to think that the CRA Advisory Board was capable of preparing the criteria within one month. She felt the process was more involved.

Ms. Hollar stated that was the reason that they developed some concepts of criteria and that they had been working with the CRA staff. She further stated they would not be adopting criteria and would have to go through the public hearing process.

Commissioner Trantalis clarified that they wanted the criteria in place before the allocation from the County. Commissioner Hutchinson stated that if an ordinance was done to suspend the allocation and they worked through the criteria, then they would have sufficient time.

The City Attorney stated that in effect it would be a moratorium and they would have to identify the problem and a reasonable amount of time to resolve the problem before permits were issued again. He reiterated that they would have all the "reasonable time," but it would have to be identified up front.

The City Attorney stated that the Mayor's suggestion was excellent and it would solve a lot of problems regarding lawsuits because it was not possible to allocate something the City did not have. He stated there was a down side which was a political one. He explained that when they went back in November and the City stated they were ready for the units so that redevelopment could begin, the County could say

they were going to be in charge.

The City Manager reiterated that they did not know what the County was going to do and they had heard some rumblings as to what the leanings of some of the key players might be in regard to the City. He felt they needed to position themselves so they could "drive" and determine their own destiny. He encouraged the Commission to take the position that if they were going to make a decision as to how to handle the allocation of their own units, then they needed to make the best case possible. He further stated that he felt they needed to continue with the momentum they had and proceed forward.

Mayor Naugle remarked that during the campaign he had heard a very clear message and he could not support moving forward at this time.

Commissioner Moore reiterated that there was a clear message in the election and it did not say they should stop development, but it was how the development mixed with the neighborhoods. He stated if they were talking about a community whereby individuals lived in a downtown area, they had to develop parcels that would give them a place to shop and work which would reduce traffic. He felt the message was that they needed to plan how the City did development, and he felt that with the criteria they were proposing there would be opportunity to discuss affordable units being attached, along with other available opportunities. Commissioner Moore reiterated that he did not feel it was a direct "no," but "how," and if done would it be compatible with the lifestyle they desired.

Mayor Naugle reiterated that it was not a matter of stopping development, but it should be a more carefully planned development.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that whether it was April or May they should suspend the allocation of units to a time certain and asked if the same things could be accomplished. Mayor Naugle remarked it was the same except for the lawsuit.

The City Attorney stated there was a difference. He reiterated that no matter what happened with the lawsuit, if they did not have the units they could not distribute them. He stated that if the City did have the units, there was the chance that they would be successful, but there was the chance that a Judge would say one couldn't change the rules in the middle of the game, and therefore, could order the City to allocate them to a specific development.

The City Attorney stated that one of the problems they faced was that all the meetings were held in public, and they could find themselves cross-ways with the County in the very near future.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that he did not feel they could anticipate what 9 County Commissioners would do, but Mayor Naugle stated that the chances of the County approving the units might be greater if they saw that a plan was in place, as opposed to them giving the City carte blanche to do whatever with the units. He felt that it made sense to keep the machine going because the County would probably say "get yourselves together and get your rules in place." He felt that could be the County's philosophy.

Mr. Chatterton clarified that on April 24, 2003, it was specifically the Broward County Planning Council.

Commissioner Moore stated that the correspondence they had received from the Council on January 21, 2003, stated their position very clearly and what approach they wanted the City to take, and he reiterated that it was not a hostile environment. He reiterated that he preferred to be the "Captain of his own ship."

John Rodstrom, County Commissioner, stated that he wanted to clear up any misunderstanding the Commission might have regarding the County's intention regarding flex units. He stated that Commissioner Smith had met with him due to the fact that the City had run out of residential units in the downtown. He advised Commissioner Smith that he would not allow for any additional residential units, but he would allow for flex units to be relocated within the City into the downtown and urban core. He

stated that at the time there was no long-range plan for how the downtown would be developed, and therefore, he had requested that the City do a study. He further stated that it appeared to him there was a lot of construction going on, and there could be a question as to whether infrastructure was in place, along with the question of school capacity. He assured the Commission that the County did not want the City's flex units to use as they wished. Obviously, there was some consternation regarding flex units because they felt that historically they had been abused in many places, and therefore, they attempted to gain more control over them. He reiterated that they did not want to control the development of the downtown and the flex units.

Mr. Rodstrom further stated that he would like to see the City wait until their study was finished, and take some breathing room and get the infrastructure in place to catch up to all the construction taking place. He suggested they slow the process down and step back, and not move on this item at this time.

Mayor Naugle reiterated that he had suggested that the City notify the County they were not ready to receive the flex units and postpone that until November. The study would be done in July and that would give them time to arrive at a plan as to how to allocate those units. He felt it would also give the City the chance to obtain some cost recovery.

Mr. Rodstrom stated that he agreed with that suggestion and wanted everyone to work together in solving some of the apparent issues.

Commissioner Moore stated that was an ingenious concept, but there was also another suggestion which was to accept the allocation of the units now, and that criteria be prepared utilizing the CRA Advisory Board and the Planning Council, and meet the same time line. He agreed there had to be a relationship with the City as a municipal entity and the County deal with transportation since that was their baby. He stated that when it came to the units and how the City wanted to design them or allocate them, it should be the City's decision.

Mr. Rodstrom stated that appearances were everything, and from his vantage point he felt the public spoke during the last election process, and even though the results would be the same, he felt the message they would be sending out would be different than what the Mayor was proposing.

The Commission agreed to ask for a deferral of the flex units with the exception of Commissioner Moore who disagreed.

Commissioner Rodstrom stated that he wanted to touch upon the transit plan presented to the Commission recently and why the County did not support that plan at least from his vantage point. He stated that the largest component of that plan had an HOV lane on Broward Boulevard in both directions for a rail system. The problem with that was that they were taking up a lane of traffic which was important as access to the downtown. In addition, it appeared that all "their eggs were being put in one basket," and the County Commission did not want to find themselves in competition with that and other things they felt which could be possible. Globally, they felt one of the most important issues was connecting the downtowns. He felt accessing the downtown would be crucial as far as the City's livelihood in moving forward. He stated that the County felt it was a "band-aid" approach, but that did not mean that they would not consider something like light rail especially if it would be elevated or if it could be located in another area. They felt they might be endorsing the wrong type of plan before everyone was in agreement.

**Action:** Request to be made to the Broward County Planning Council to defer allocation of flex units until November, 2003.

#### **I-C – Proposed New River Master Build-Out Plan for Day Dockage**

The City Manager stated that this was a recommendation from the Marine Advisory Board.

Jamie Hart, Supervisor of Marine Facilities, stated that this was a Marine Advisory Board recommendation and proceeded to introduce the Chairman of that Board, Joe Hessmann.

Joe Hessmann stated that the Marine Advisory Board had been discussing this matter for a long time, and they had recommended to the City Manager to give direction to the Engineering Department to proceed with the CRMP, and also for the development of a River Master Plan. He explained that the motion otherwise was for floating docks. This had been approved at the Board's December meeting. He stated that the issue was whether staff would be hired to complete the project or whether an outside consultant should be hired. He felt it would encourage the small boater to participate in all River functions.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 3:18 p.m.

Mr. Hessmann reiterated that small boat dockage was disappearing in the City and they recommended that a consultant be hired to get the job done as quickly as possible.

Mayor Naugle stated that he felt part of the problem was that in order to build floating docks, the Department had taken the position that a master plan was needed in order to obtain permits from the State and it could not be done on a piecemeal basis. On the other hand, whether these docks would be used and how they would be used was the question. He suggested that possibly a pilot program could be installed at one location to see how things worked before proceeding and spending money on a master plan.

Mr. Hart stated that the State had changed their position slightly.

Hector Castro, City Engineer, stated that in his most recent conversations with both DEP and the Florida Fish & Wildlife Association, they appeared more interested in a Manatee Protection Plan and before they were willing to permit additional traffic on the River from recreational boating, they wanted the City to take a more active role in such a protection plan.

Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting at approximately 3:20 p.m.

Mr. Castro stated that presently they had been working with the County and had expressed their frustrations that things were moving slowly and he suggested that perhaps the City could get more involved. He felt that as part of that plan some day dockage could be constructed. He further stated that they were accommodating the new seawall at Marshall's Point for some future dockage and some stepdowns had been installed.

Commissioner Teel stated that this discussion regarding day dockage had been taking place for a number of years. She asked what length boat the docks would be able to accommodate. Mr. Castro stated that the County was talking about 30' and under. Commissioner Teel asked if there was a mechanism available for doing a prototype as suggested. Mr. Castro stated there were some along the north side and he felt that they could be improved upon.

Mayor Naugle asked about floating docks. Mr. Castro stated that since this was on State submerged land, they would have to obtain a permit.

Commissioner Teel asked that since they were doing a limited number, there might be a point that they would not have to get involved with the complete process.

Mayor Naugle asked if a pilot program could be set in place. Mr. Castro stated they had never asked the question in that way, but they could go back to the State and do so.

Commissioner Teel reiterated that she felt that was the way to proceed.

Mr. Hart remarked that the protection plan was the second phase which was a dock siting plan which he felt they needed to endorse as well.

Commissioner Teel reiterated that a pilot program would be the way to go because they could acquire more information and then build the proper facility. She asked if this had gone before the Riverwalk Advisory Committee. Mr. Hart stated they had not had time to do that, but it could be done. Commissioner Teel felt that should be done.

Chuck Adams stated that day dockage was part of the Riverwalk Master Plan. He felt the real issue was location. He agreed that they should start out small and see what the demand was for them.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that since funding was not available for master planning, she asked if Marine Industries or Broward County could help, along with any available grants. Mr. Hart replied that they knew that grants would cover construction costs, but they did not cover permitting or design costs.

Mayor Naugle stated that in order to address the comment of the Marine Board, they wanted the master plan to proceed and to have it contracted out. He reiterated that possibly the day dockage could be tried on a limited basis.

Mr. Hart stated that possibly the marine industry would contribute some funds towards the hiring of a consultant.

Commissioner Moore remarked that the idea was great, but asked if they would still have to go through the process due to the fact that it was submerged land.

Mr. Adams stated that on tonight's Commission Agenda they had an amendment to extend the Submerged Land Lease. He stated that when they first had the lease five years ago, they had captured the area, and he felt it was a matter of timing to construct on the undeveloped portions.

Commissioner Teel suggested that they track the matter very carefully to assure that an accurate report would be given.

**Action:** Proceed with a prototype and seek recommendations from the Marine Advisory Board in regard to a location.

**I-D – Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) - Proposed Improvements to U.S. 1 (Federal Highway) from Commercial Boulevard to McNab Road (C-14 Canal)**

Peter Partington, Engineering Division, introduced the individuals present from DOT, along with the consultants. Messrs. Austin and Hanna from the Department of Transportation, and their consultants, Mr. Nabello and Mr. Al Kessing.

Mr. Partington stated that the two major remaining issues appeared to be related to the Department of Transportation's proposal to remove the flashing traffic signal at Northeast 55<sup>th</sup> Street which was the entrance to The Landings on one side, and an entrance to the Church on the other side. He proceeded to show on the map the area in question.

Mr. Partington stated that the signal flashes with a red arrow and stops traffic in the opposite direction. He explained that The Landings wanted to retain the traffic signal, but the Department of Transportation's proposal was to remove it. He further stated that the second issue was that NE 57<sup>th</sup> Street was the main road with access to The Lake Estates neighborhood which consisted of about 200 homes east of Federal

Highway, and the proposal was to put an element into the intersection which was what they called a

“peanut” and prevented left turns out of the side streets, specifically 57<sup>th</sup> Street.

Dominic Novello, III, consultant, stated that when they evaluated the entire corridor, they had come to the Commission with a recommendation. In the meantime they had met with the Homeowners Association who stated their concerns. The situation was re-evaluated and the result was that the median which was closed at Imperial Point Drive could now make a northbound left turn. He explained that when the signal at 56<sup>th</sup> Street turned red, traffic would backup to a point past the intersection at 57<sup>th</sup> Street, and significant problems were occurring. Mr. Novello remarked that they had spoken with various business owners at those corners and they were in support of the “peanut” that would be installed.

Mr. Novello stated that they had re-analyzed the situation at The Landings and explained the problems occurring in that area. He stated that the access would remain and they were only going to remove the element causing the problems and accidents.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the traffic would be stopped going north when cars would be turning left into The Landings. Mr. Novello confirmed.

Commissioner Teel stated that she could not visualize not having some type of traffic controlled device in the area. She felt many problems would occur. She further asked if the flashing yellow light was causing the problem, could they not replace it with a regular traffic signal or some other type of signalization.

Rafiq Alqasem, consultant, explained that at an intersection one needed certain warrants to require signalization. In this corridor, he explained there were 3 locations where over 20 years ago as part of an experiment, DOT and the County had decided to install flashing lights. He stated they were not normally used, and DOT had requested them to look at those 3 locations and determine if those sites should be converted to full signalization or if they should remove the flashing signals. He explained that during their analysis they had projected a huge traffic growth up to 2025, and projected that growth and background for US1. He stated they had then created the micro-simulation model which evaluated every element in the entire corridor. He stated they could not find any reason to signalize that intersection.

Commissioner Teel asked if they had taken into consideration the new residential developments being constructed north of 62<sup>nd</sup> Street on the west side of US1. She stated they were not aware of how many accidents they might have prevented by having the flashing signal at that site.

Mr. Alqasem acknowledged that there was a lot of traffic in the area and felt that more police enforcement might be necessary for that corridor.

Joe Welsch, President of The Landings Association, stated they had great concern in the area because there were many children attending the Westminster Academy and Northeast High School in the area, along with many of the older students driving to those schools. He felt there would be a lot of young inexperienced drivers attempting to cross 45mph traffic. He further stated that one of the studies done in December of last year showed that there were 950 turns from each side of the street at that site. He believed if the signal was removed, there would be a great safety hazard.

Lloyd Northfleet stated that he felt a traffic light was necessary at the subject location.

George Weaver stated that the left turn for their building at 5300 N. Federal Highway was 100' south. He also believed a traffic light was necessary for this location.

Pat Hale, District 1 Alliance, stated that she had distributed a letter supporting the directional light for the area. She also stated that the Police Department could verify how valuable it was to have gaps in the traffic and egress for The Landings.

Bunney Brennerman, 52<sup>nd</sup> Street resident, stated that she believed a traffic signal was necessary for the site, and was against complete removal of a traffic signal.

Betty Shelley, Imperial Point Homeowners Association, thanked everyone for leaving her intersection open.

Mr. Welsch added that a young girl had died due to an accident involving a U-turn in the area.

The City Manager stated that they wanted to clarify the recommendation being made and possibly some of the issues raised could be answered.

Mr. Partington explained that the recommendation was that the signal for southbound to eastbound left turn would be retained, but not the signal for the northbound to westbound left turn. He stated that he had spoken to a representative of the school and they had direct discussions with DOT and indicated they were agreeable to the northbound to westbound signal being removed.

Mr. Partington further stated that the recommendation at 57<sup>th</sup> Street was to admit the "peanut" and allowing left turns from the side street.

Commissioner Teel stated that would make sense as long as the Church and School agreed.

**Action:** Approved staff recommendation.

#### **I-E – School Board of Broward County Facility Study Update**

Mayor Naugle stated that he and Commissioner Moore were going to attend the League of Cities annual meeting in Tallahassee on April 1, 2003. He stated that after this update had been provided, they wanted a representative or representatives to be designated to attend the meeting for them.

Commissioner Moore left the meeting at approximately 3:52 p.m.

Leslie Carhart, Community and Economic Development, stated that the document was very complicated and cumbersome and she had been working with members of the Education Advisory Board. She stated that the Commission had been given a February version of the plan and alerted to the fact that it was an evolving document. She stated that there was a subsequent version on March 11, 2003 and they were presently analyzing that document. She further stated that at the workshop on March 11, 2003, additional information had been provided regarding Life Cycle and Facility Deficiency Information. She stated they had expected that March 18, 2003 would have been the "drop date" for this to be presented to the School Board and approved. She explained that at the March 11, 2003 meeting they had revised their approach and decided that on April 1, 2003, they would accept the report as opposed to approving it. She further explained that the summary sheet served to contrast and compare what had been in the February version of the study, and what was now in the March 11<sup>th</sup> version.

Commissioner Moore returned to the meeting at approximately 3:57 p.m.

Ms. Carhart stated that in view of the new numbers, they needed to see where they now stood. She stated they needed to see how the different categories and funding levels were defined for a major/minor/moderate renovation versus a partial or complete replacement. She further stated that they had to take the life cycle information, which was the ongoing recapitalization, along with some of the other deficiency data, and compare the listings on a school-by-school basis to the already adopted work plan in order to segregate what was ongoing and funded versus the new and additional. She continued stating that their priorities for the complete replacement of Fort Lauderdale and Stranahan had not happened. There had been an increase in funding at Stranahan, but there was a reduction in funding for Fort Lauderdale High School. She stated their objectives for fully renovating and/or replacing all the

elementary schools had not been met, and there was no resolution involving the issue of not surplusing

any additional properties and getting South Side off the surplus list.

Ms. Carhart reported that the analysis was very complicated. She explained they were going to pull all data sheets and package it with aerial footprints of every school in the City, and that would be the base reference information. She stated the Commission needed to discuss how they should communicate their interests to the School Board on April 1, 2003 and what correspondence should be provided to them in advance of that meeting. Ms. Carhart stated that the City continued to get used as an example during School Board discussions.

Mary Fertig stated they had spent a great deal of time in an attempt to work with the consultants and the School Board in order to explain the City's needs, and to make an argument that the schools had not been adequately addressed. She stated they had a lot of good information, but they were still reviewing it. She explained that they had a number of theories such as the fact that it was more expensive to do business on the east than anywhere else in the County. She stated they acknowledged that land costs, when they had failed to plan ahead for adequate land, was more expensive on the east, but they were not sure why construction costs were more. Mr. Fertig continued stating that they had claimed they had spent more per student in the City's schools than in anyone else's. She stated they were predicting that the City's enrollment would be declining in their schools and they believed that to be a major fallacy and one that needed to be addressed on April 1, 2003.

Ms. Fertig stated that as an explanation as to why they did not need to do as much for the City's schools was that the older the school, the better it had been built. She stated that she had prepared a sheet as to what they had proposed in the original plan and what they were now proposing for the high schools. She stated they were finally acknowledging that Stranahan High School needed a partial replacement. She further explained that 3 new buildings had been constructed to house the medical and engineering magnet, but the remainder dated back to 1951 and needed replaced. She stated they felt that not enough money had been planned for the replacement. She explained they were getting \$6.5 more than stated in the original plan for the partial replacement, but they needed substantial replacements.

Ms. Fertig stated they were not sure that \$12 Million would be sufficient in connection with the replacements at Fort Lauderdale High School. She stated that one of their biggest concerns dealt with the retention of properties which had been surplused, and they had hoped to see a recommendation in the report stating that any property in the City on the surplus list, other than Sailboat Bend, be retained for future growth, but that recommendation had not yet been made. She stated there had been no change in the demographic projections. She did not feel that accepting this report in its present format was a good idea. She felt the report needed to be amended in order to address the deficiencies. Ms. Fertig explained that there were recommendations for some new schools, but within those recommendations there were priorities 1 through 5. She announced that they did acknowledge that the two high schools needed to be replaced, but before the report was finalized they wanted to make sure that monies would be allocated for those replacements.

Commissioner Moore stated that he saw one major problem in the report and that was Sunland Elementary School. He stated that this school sat on 3 acres of land with a drycleaning business and auto body and paint shop adjacent to it, along with negative air quality impacts for the children. There was inadequate parking and transportation and there were parcels of vacant land around the school. He stated that it was perplexing why no one had addressed the matter of the acquisition of the businesses for their removal, along with the vacant property which could double the acreage for the site. He asked if anything was being considered for that site.

Ms. Fertig stated that one of the things they were reviewing was the "deficiency list," and she proceeded to give the example of Walker Elementary.

Mayor Naugle stated that the City had a block of land which was contiguous to Walker that they were



going to make available for the development of homes.

Ms. Carhart stated there was a deficiency of the footprint. Commissioner Moore stated that with Walker Elementary and Sunland Elementary, there could be changes as to what was permitted in a design for an elementary school. He felt the portables could be removed and they could then deal with a two-story structure on the land which was available on site at Walker. He stated at Sunland Elementary there was inadequate opportunities for maneuvering traffic in and out of the site, and it was certainly an issue in connection with the environmental impact. He reiterated that due to the toxins from the adjoining businesses, it should be a priority of the School Board to acquire those properties.

Ms. Fertig stated that in connection with Sunland Park, they had stated that the expansion was pending. Mayor Naugle clarified that they did not have any details as to whether this was being funded or not. Ms. Fertig confirmed.

Commissioner Moore suggested that when this came up for discussion, they would have many residents from that area at the meeting because this was a matter they were very concerned about. He further stated that he was concerned about how the monies would be allocated for the acquisition, and he felt it was something that needed to be done.

Ms. Carhart stated that she did not know the exact time of that meeting. She also stated that she would attempt to obtain backup data per school for the Commission so they could get feedback from the residents as to what was needed and the prioritization of those items.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she wanted to make sure that Edgewood Elementary which consisted of 12 acres would not be on a surplus list. She stated that presently it was not being used to its full potential, and was a viable school.

Mayor Naugle remarked that it appeared that from the chart they had gone down in money from the February report, and he asked if other areas in the County had also gone down. Ms. Fertig explained that they had subtracted \$25 Million from Fort Lauderdale High School because they were currently under construction. She stated their response would be that they should not adjust for what had already been funded. Ms. Fertig further stated that their concern was to go back and say they were glad the School Board recognized the need to rebuild the schools, but they did not believe that proper resources were being allocated.

Mayor Naugle remarked that the backup plan could be to have a Charter School system for the City.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that some of the choices of the School Board appeared illogical, and asked if they were driven by their lack of resources in making some of their decisions. He asked how they could help them along to best allocate their limited resources. Ms. Fertig stated that was a good question. She replied that the City was 17% of the tax base and no one wanted overcrowded schools.

The City Manager stated that when the Commission had first considered this matter with the Education Advisory Board, they asked that a strong message be given to the School Board that they would not support any bond initiative unless Fort Lauderdale got an appropriate share for their schools. In terms of encouraging them to do the right thing, he felt this was a clear message.

Commissioner Hutchinson reiterated that they needed to carry a strong message because they had been "snookered" with the County Parks Bond. She stated that nothing was happening in the City and they had paid a tremendous amount of money into that bond. She felt it was time they did whatever necessary to make sure the City's schools were as good as those out west.

**Action:** Approved Exhibit 1 as the City Commission Policy, with the addition of Edgewood and Sunland Elementary Schools.

**CRA MEETING WAS CONVENED AT 4:25 P.M.****COMMISSION CONFERENCE MEETING RECONVENED AT 4:52 P.M.****I-F – Single Entrance Fee for Parking for Special Events**

Mayor Naugle stated that he wanted the memorandum corrected for the record because he did not want the City giving the impression that they were price gouging for special events. He felt the rate should be \$1.50 per hour.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she wanted to leave the lot open because it was Spring Break.

Doug Gottshall, Parking Director, stated that the Oceanside lot would remain open as would the Sabastian and Alhambra Street lots for the public. He added that the Oceanside lot would have a \$6 single-entry rate, and he explained that one of the underlying reasons they did this was because it was difficult during a special event to return to feed the meters. He added that some of the private lots charged anywhere from \$25 to \$50 during special events. Mayor Naugle remarked that he had thought the Oceanside lot was \$10. Mr. Gottshall agreed and stated that he had made an error previously stating it would be \$6.

Commissioner Moore felt this matter should be discussed at a future meeting so feedback could be given to the Commission. He stated that his concern was that they had the opportunity to explain how the dollar amount had been arrived at, and why various sites had been chosen for those rates. Commissioner Moore suggested that certain meters be chosen for a limited period of time with free parking provided.

Ken Strand stated that an event had been held at the Performing Arts Center and there had been a special event charge of \$3 for parking. He further stated that he did not understand why that charged had been posted since the people were only there for a short time frame.

Mayor Naugle stated that he did not agree with a special event rate being charged for short-time parking.

Bud Bentley, Assistant City Manager, stated it was not a revenue issue. He explained that one issue was logistics and when there was a special event at the beach, gridlock would occur, and one of the purposes of a special event fee was to make parking expensive so people would car pool or look for alternative transportation. He stated that promoters organized up to 11,000 remote parking spaces, and he felt it would be inconsistent to put out the message that free parking was available at the beach.

Mr. Bentley stated when special events were held and people were attempting to find a parking space, they would fill up the lots and then wait until someone returned to their car. He reiterated that this caused conflicts between the people waiting on the spots who were competing for the spots. He explained the lots would be manned and when someone exited, the someone else would be permitted to enter.

Commissioner Trantalis clarified that one goal during an event on the beach was to set aside enough parking for the participants because if that was not done, then people would get frustrated and be deprived of parking spaces, but the \$10 charge would dissuade casual participants.

Mayor Naugle stated he was not looking at the situation from the standpoint of the people participating in the event, but he had been thinking of the casual users of the lot. He further stated that the promoters did not advertise parking locations.

**Action:** Commission agreed to a \$10 rate for special event parking.

**II-A – Accelerated Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Quarterly Report for the First Quarter of 2003**

Commissioner Hutchinson asked what the \$271,000 had been budgeted for in connection with Station 47. She asked if they were going to do life safety code improvements if they were going to completely rebuild the station.

Commissioner Trantalis left the meeting at approximately 4:56 p.m.

Alan Gavazzi, Chief Architect, confirmed, and stated that the \$271,000 had been for the repairs for the entire station. Commissioner Hutchinson asked how long the modular unit would remain in the backyard. Mr. Gavazzi stated that it would be delivered on site.

Commissioner Trantalis returned to the meeting at approximately 4:57 p.m.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked how long it would be there before construction began. Mr. Gavazzi stated that funding was the biggest issue at this time.

Commissioner Teel stated that the building at George English Park would still be inadequate for the neighborhood it was serving.

Greg Kisela, Assistant City Manager, stated that they would present some options to the Commission.

Commissioner Moore asked for an update regarding the relocation of the trash transfer station. The City Manager remarked that it was not a part of the accelerated CIP. He explained they had explored the matter in an attempt to better use the site, but since their first efforts failed they had not revisited this matter.

Commissioner Moore asked if they could check and see if there were any alternative locations for the Trash Transfer Station which could be considered, and if there were no alternative sites available, then they needed to make a decision to improve the blight.

**Action:** Options to be presented to the Commission.

**III-B – Advisory Board Appointments****Budget Advisory Board**

**Action:** Deferred

**Code Enforcement Board**

Commissioner Hutchinson appointed Richard Mancuso as an alternate for the Code Enforcement Board.

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at the Regular Meeting.

**Community Appearance Board**

**Action:** Deferred

**Economic Development Board**

**Action:** Deferred

Education Advisory Board

Commissioner Moore appointed Gwen Watson for the Education Advisory Board.

**Action:** Formal action to be taken at the Regular Meeting.

Unsafe Structures and Housing Appeals Board

**Action:** Deferred

**CLOSED DOOR MEETING WAS CONVENED AT 5:05 P.M.**

**COMMISSION CONFERENCE MEETING RECONVENED AT 5:20 P.M.**

**IV – Commission Reports**

FDOT PROJECTS

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that one FDOT project was at US 1 and SE 17 Street, and she asked if that matter was coming back to the Commission.

The City Manager confirmed.

Commissioner Hutchinson also stated that DOT was going to make changes on State Road 84 at SW 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and asked if that project was going to come before the Commission. She remarked that the community had already received a letter regarding the project.

The City Manager stated they would check on the matter.

Fire Safety Issues for Condominiums

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that she had read that Representative Mack was going to push for legislation regarding condominiums and granting them relief. She stated this was a life safety fire issue, but yet they were being granted 12 years to comply.

The City Manager stated that Chief Latin had raised this issue before the Commission in the past and laid the plans for alternative payments, along with alternative means to address such concerns.

Commissioner Hutchinson asked if the City needed to have their lobbyist be aware of this at State level.

Mayor Naugle felt that a discussion should be held regarding both sides of the matter. He felt he did not have enough information regarding this matter at the present time.

Commissioner Teel stated that individuals were concerned about this matter because even though they were being given 12 years, it placed a lien on their property.

**Action:** Item to be placed on Conference Agenda for April 3, 2003.

River Oaks Property Acquisition

Commissioner Hutchinson asked for an update regarding River Oaks.

Greg Kisela, Assistant City Manager, stated that they had appraisals, an offer had been made, and it had been countered twice.

Commissioner Hutchinson requested that this matter be discussed further.

FPL - Colee Hammock and Victoria Park

Commissioner Hutchinson stated she had received a letter from the Colee Hammock Homeowners Association that FPL had stated they were to quit their voluntary moratorium on 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and would begin working by the end of March.

Mayor Naugle commented that the Commission had been assured by the City Manager that FPL would come before the Commission before resuming work.

Greg Kisela, Assistant City Manager, stated that this would be on the agenda at the March 25, 2003 Citizens Advisory Committee on FPL, and should be presented to the Commission on April 3, 2003. He reiterated that FPL had talked about a need being resolved by the end of March, but they had made a commitment to the Commission that they would not proceed until they returned before this Commission.

Commissioner Trantalis stated that at the last meeting of the Victoria Park Civic Association, FPL representatives presented 4 different proposals and residents were asked to vote on them. He felt all four proposals were unacceptable and believed that FPL was very adamant about cutting through 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He stated that a plan of action was needed.

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that Colee Hammock had taken a stand regarding 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue and she was not in support of this.

Mr. Kisela reiterated that this Commission had formed the FPL Citizens Advisory Committee to discuss and research the matter and then make a recommendation to the Commission. He further stated that recommendation would be presented on April 3, 2003.

He stated they had heard pros and cons regarding undergrounding, 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and modifications had been made to the original project.

Commissioner Hutchinson reiterated that she just wanted to be assured of FPL's commitment.

MPO Appointments

Commissioner Hutchinson stated she wanted to submit her name for an MPO appointment.

Mayor Naugle remarked that he had asked the City Clerk to prepare a grid of all matters coming up.

Flea Market at Gay and Lesbian Community Center (GLCC)

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that they were looking for a time frame since one had not been given to them regarding this matter. She stated that she was aware that Sue Molnar was working on a special events application, but it would not solve their problem since the event was held twice a month.

Mayor Naugle suggested that they could amend the Special Event rule to permit something twice a month, or ask them to hold their event only once a month.

**Action:** Update on GLCC

Police Department

Commissioner Moore stated that he wanted to congratulate the police on how they had handled the 2 shootings, and felt that the communication and outreach to the community had been done very well.

Commissioner Moore suggested that a time line be offered in reference to when the Grand Jury would evaluate the process offered, and he hoped they would utilize the print media to allow them to know the time line.

#### Elections

Commissioner Moore thanked the City Clerk for a great job on the elections.

The City Clerk thanked the City Manager and the Information Technology staff, as well as all the City employees who had helped during the election.

#### Orientation for New City Commission

Commissioner Moore suggested there be an orientation program for the new Commission members.

#### Theater Evacuation

Commissioner Moore asked for an update regarding the theater discussed at the previous meeting.

Otis Latin, Chief Fire-Rescue, stated that on the same date Commissioner Moore reported this potential problem, the Fire Marshall had gone to the location and stated that the exit had met all code requirements.

Commissioner Moore stated there was no indication that once you got out the exit door that you could escape from the area due to a barbed wire fence.

Commissioner Moore stated that he had watched 60 Minutes when the program had addressed fire sprinklers, and asked what the requirement was for restaurants in the City.

Chief Latin stated that he would check on the numbers and provide them to the Commission. He assured the Commission that there was a good sprinkler ordinance in place for the City and they were checked.

#### Crossing Guards/Rock Island Elementary

Commissioner Moore stated that since there were 2 new schools on 19<sup>th</sup> Street and 23<sup>rd</sup>, Rock Island was now in the unincorporated area of the County as well as in the City of Fort Lauderdale, and he proceeded to ask who was responsible for the crossing guards. He also asked what was being done regarding signage for the area.

Bruce Larkin, Director Administrative Services, stated that they were responsible for the guards, but he did not have all the details. He further stated that he would have Ronna Adams who coordinated the program provide a report to the Commission.

Greg Kisela, Assistant City Manager, stated that within the last month the City had sent a letter to the School Board and the County in relation to crosswalks for the schools.

Commissioner Moore remarked that there were no visible markings for the area.

#### Convenience Store at NW 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 19<sup>th</sup> Street

Commissioner Moore stated that this store was going to be busier due to the fact that kids from the schools would be going there, and he wanted to know if they could meet with the owner of the property to discuss changing the entrance to the building. He felt there could be safety problems due to where the entrance was located at this time.

Traffic Light at Bayview and Commercial

Commissioner Teel stated that the cycle for the traffic light at Bayview and Commercial only permitted two cars through at a time. She wanted to know if something could be done about this.

62<sup>nd</sup> Street - Speeding from US 1 to Dixie Highway

Commissioner Teel stated that she had been on 62<sup>nd</sup> Street during her campaigning and she had been astounded at the speeding which occurred in that area.

Bruce Roberts, Chief of Police, stated that they routinely enforced the area, but they would attempt to step up their enforcement. He stated that the Association was planning some type of road improvements and enhancements which would have some speed calming effects for the area. He also added that there was a heavy volume of traffic on that specific roadway.

Mayor of Miami Beach/Bill Regarding Property Rights

Mayor Naugle stated that he had received a call from the Mayor of Miami Beach who was concerned about a bill introduced regarding property rights and the Bert Harris Act. He stated that Representative Geller was sponsoring the bill and he felt the City needed to make sure that their lobbyist was well informed on the issue.

**V - City Manager Reports**

City Commission Workshop

The City Manager stated that there were 5 weeks in April and 3 meetings were scheduled, one of which was with the CRA. He stated that they were going to check with the Commission regarding their schedules as to the best date to have an organizational session, and to establish some goals and objectives. He stated that he wanted to give the Commission some information regarding his outlook for the next year.

The City Manager also stated that it was his intent to make City staff available on an ongoing basis regarding orientation for the new Commission members. He felt it was very helpful to tour each department.

Artist Marcell/Donation of Firefighter Sculpture

The City Manager stated that the donation of the firefighter sculpture was a wonderful gesture, but before accepting it they needed to decide on a site and to check if the Commission had any objections.

Mayor Naugle stated that he would rely on what the Chief and department had decided.

The City Manager further stated that the Chief was in favor of this and wanted it properly placed.

Mayor Naugle asked what was going to happen to the memorial at the old No. 2 Station.

Otis Latin, Chief Fire-Rescue, informed the Commission that the memorial would be moved from the old station to the new one.

Support for the Armed Forces

Commissioner Teel asked if a resolution could be adopted at tonight's meeting to express the City's support for the Armed Forces.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

**Note: A mechanical recording has been made of the foregoing proceedings of which these minutes are a part, and is on file in the office of the City clerk for a period of two years.**